

Serial No. **10/021,439**  
Amdt. dated October 4, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of May 8, 2006

Docket No. **K-0359**

### **REMARKS**

By the present response, Applicant has canceled claims 5 and 13 without disclaimer. Further, Applicant has amended the specification and claim 1 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14 and 16-26 remain pending in this application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, the disclosure has been objected to because of informalities. Claim 5 has been objected to because of informalities. Claims 1-28 have been rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of U.S. Publication No, 2002/0080788 (Lee). Claims 1-14 and 16-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,594,267 (Dempo).

#### **Specification Objections**

The disclosure has been objected to because of informalities. Applicant has amended the specification to further clarify the invention and respectfully requests that these objections be withdrawn.

#### **Claim Objections**

Claim 5 has been objected to because of informalities. Applicant has canceled this claim

Serial No. **10/021,439**  
Amdt. dated October 4, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of May 8, 2006

Docket No. **K-0359**

Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 1-28 have been rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/00800788. Applicant is filing concurrently with this response a terminal disclaimer therefore rendering these rejections moot.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-14 and 16-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dempo. Applicant has discussed the deficiencies of Dempo in Applicant's previously filed response and reassert all arguments submitted in that response. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and provides the following additional remarks.

Regarding claims 1, 14 and 16, Applicant submits that Dempo does not disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, reading stored CPS packets in the order of the stored first identifiers, sequentially storing the read CPS packets in second storage areas used to route the CPS packets to each destination, and sequentially storing second identifiers of the second storage areas in accordance with respective destination channel identifiers, where the origination channel identifiers of the read CPS packets are changed to corresponding destination channel identifiers, and sequentially stored in the second storage areas corresponding to the destination channel identifiers. The Examiner asserts that Dempo discloses sequentially storing the read CPS packets in the second storage areas

corresponding to the destination channel identifiers, in figures 4 and 5 and col. 8, lines 23-31. However, these portions merely disclose that the CPS packet FIFO memory 18 stores the CPS packets outputted by the CPS packet processing section 17, and the second FIFO memory 19 stores internal addresses #2 and LI information concerning each of the CPS packets stored in the CPS packet FIFO memory 18, and that the internal addresses #2 concerning each of the CPS packets are supplied from the control section to the CPS packet processing section 17, and stored in the second FIFO memory 19. This is not sequentially storing the read CPS packets in the second storage areas corresponding to the destination channel identifiers, as recited in the claims of the present application. Dempo merely discloses that internal addresses #2 concerning each of the CPS packets, are stored along with an associated channel identifier as shown in figure 5. Dempo does not disclose or suggest sequentially storing the read CPS packets in correspondence with the destination CIDs.

Regarding claims 2-4, 6-12 and 17-26, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1 and 16 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Dempo does not disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-4, 6-12, 14 and 16-26 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Serial No. **10/021,439**  
Amdt. dated October 4, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of May 8, 2006

Docket No. **K-0359**

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-4, 6-12, 14 and 16-26 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim  
Registration No. 36,186  
Frederick D. Bailey  
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tlg

**Date: October 4, 2006**

\\Fk4\Documents\2016\2016-124\93978.doc

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**